

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

I. Amendments to the Claims

Claims 1, 13, 14 and 15 have been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, in order to overcome the objection discussed below in detail.

II. Objection to the Claims

Claims 1, 13, 14 and 15 were objected to for reciting “can be,” which is allegedly indefinite. As mentioned above, claims 1, 13, 14 and 15 have been amended to overcome this objection by replacing the phrase “can be,” with the term “is.” As a result withdrawal of this objection is respectfully requested.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 13 has been identified as being allowable. The Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for this indication of allowability. The scope of claim 13 remains unchanged and remains allowable.

IV. 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejection

Claims 1-8, 10, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Nakano (U.S. 2003/0081792) and Kocher (U.S. 20046/0133794). This rejection is respectfully traversed for the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 recites a content reproduction apparatus including, in part, an index information output unit operable to output, via a video output unit, only index information (indicating a device key stored in a secret information storage unit and corresponding to the content reproduction apparatus) converted by a video processing unit to cause a display apparatus to display the index information converted by the video processing unit, the index information converted by the video processing unit being output to the display apparatus based on an instruction received by an instruction receiving unit.

Initially, please note that the above-described 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection acknowledges that Nakano fails to disclose or suggest the features of the index information output unit, as recited in claim 1. In light of the above this rejection relies on paragraphs [0143] and [0145] of Kocher for teaching the above-mentioned features which are lacking from Nakano. However, it is respectfully submitted that Kocher fails to disclose or suggest the structure required by the index information output unit, as recited in claim 1.

Rather, Kocher merely teaches that an index value identifies a secret key to be used for decryption and teaches outputting data, which is transformed (e.g., decompressed) if appropriate, to one or more physically-separate devices, such as audio speakers or video displays (see paragraphs [0143] and [0145]).

Thus, in view of the above, it is clear that even though Kocher teaches that the index value identifies a secret key for decryption and teaches that transformed data is output to physically-separate devices, Kocher still fails to disclose or suggest that the index information output unit outputs, via the video output unit, only the index information (indicating a device key stored in a secret information storage unit and corresponding to the content reproduction apparatus) converted by the video processing unit to cause the display apparatus to display the

index information converted by the video processing unit, the index information converted by the video processing unit being output to the display apparatus based on an instruction received by an instruction receiving unit, as required by claim 1.

Therefore, because of the above-mentioned distinctions it is believed clear that claim 1 and claims 2-8 and 10 that depend therefrom would not have been obvious or result from any combination of Nakano and Kocher.

Furthermore, there is no disclosure or suggestion in Nakano and/or Kocher or elsewhere in the prior art of record which would have caused a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify Nakano and/or Kocher to obtain the invention of independent claim 1. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-8 and 10 that depend therefrom are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

Amended independent claims 14 and 15 are directed to a method and a program, respectively and each recite features that correspond to the above-mentioned distinguishing features of independent claim 1. Thus, for the same reasons discussed above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 14 and 15 are allowable over the prior art of record.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance and an early notification thereof is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone to resolve any remaining issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kaoru YOKOTA et al.

/Andrew L. Dunlap/
By 2011.02.08 12:12:37 -05'00'

Andrew L. Dunlap
Registration No. 60,554
Attorney for Applicants

ALD/led
Washington, D.C. 20005-1503
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 8, 2011